

Appl. No. 10/806,926
Amdt. Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 11, 2006. Applicant has amended claim 1. In view of this amendment and remarks Applicant believes the application should be allowed.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's courtesy in participating in a teleconference on February 27, 2006. In the interview the pivoting feature of the adjustment bar of claim 1 was discussed. Examiner indicated that amending the claim to add such a limitation may distinguish over the Groenenberg prior art reference; however, further consideration would be necessary.

In the PTO Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groenenberg Patent No. 6,277,059 ("Groenenberg"). Applicant traverses this rejection because Groenenberg fails to teach each of the elements of claim 1. Claim 1 requires an input table attached to the housing for feeding paper sheets into the housing for processing the paper sheets according to the position of the adjustment bar, a stacking table attached to the housing for receiving the processed paper sheets exiting the housing and a stacking arm attached to the housing and extending onto the stacking table, the stacking arm having a roller for assisting in stacking of the processed paper sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table. Claim 1 also requires a mechanical link connecting the stacking arm to the adjustment bar that is pivotally attached to the housing and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate.

Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1. Groenenberg discloses rollers 42 and a stationary shaft 43 which are part of a transport roller system 33, as depicted in Fig. 4. This transport roller system 33, stationary shaft 43 and rollers 42 are not attached to the housing adjacent a stacking table and do not extend onto the stacking table. Nor do these

Appl. No. 10/806,926
Amdt. Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

components assist in stacking of paper sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table.

Groenenberg's collection tray 10 is the area where the sheets of the machine for Groenenberg begin their processing. As shown in Fig. 1, the collecting tray 10 is not near the delivery station
8.

Furthermore, there is no mechanical link depicted in Groenenberg that connects the stacking arm to the adjustment bar that is pivotally attached to the housing and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate as required by claim 1. In fact, Groenenberg fails to teach any mechanical links, as its means of adjusting components is via motors (Col. 3, line 51) and electronic sensors (Col. 5, line 41). Therefore, Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1 and therefore the rejection under §102 is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 11 was rejected under §102(b) as anticipated by or as obvious over Groenenberg in view of the Admitted Prior Art. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations thereof. As discussed above Groenenberg fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is also allowable over Groenenberg.

Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-11, 21, 23 and 24 be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman
Seyfarth Shaw
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60601-5803
312-346-8000

By 